

Precise Variational Calculation For The Doubly Excited State $(2p^2)^3P^e$ of Helium.

Tapan K. Mukherjee*and Prasanta K. Mukherjee
 Department of Spectroscopy
 Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science
 Jadavpur, Kolkata 700 032, India

Abstract

Highly precise variational calculations of non-relativistic energies of the $(2p^2)^3P^e$ state of Helium atom are presented. We get an upper bound energy $E = -0.71050015565678$ a.u., the lowest yet obtained.

1 Introduction

Multiply excited energy states in atoms have been the subject of many experimental and theoretical investigations. Specially doubly excited states (DES) for neutral helium is particularly important as the DES provide a fundamental testing ground of the accuracy of the theoretical treatment. The review article of *Holøien*¹ and *Fano*² gives a detailed list of references.

A large number of DES of neutral helium can auto-ionize to the continuum above the $1s(2S)$ ground state of He^+ . Besides, there are also non-auto-ionizing doubly excited states in helium. These exactly quantized DES states decay to the lower excited states through electric dipole interaction giving rise to sharp spectral line. It is worthwhile to mention that relativistically these states may auto-ionize, but the auto-ionization life times are still appreciably longer than the mean radiative life times of the allowed electric dipole *transition*¹.

Compton and *Boyce*³, *Kruger*⁴, *Whiddington* and *Priestley*⁵ are the pioneers to observe such exactly quantized DES of helium. Among such non-auto-ionizing doubly excited levels in helium, the $(2p^2)^3P^e$ state is the lowest lying P-state of even parity. The interpretation of $320.392A^0$ line in helium as the $(2p^2)^3P^e \rightarrow (1s2p)^3P^0$ -transition by *Kruger*⁴ was later confirmed by *Wu*⁶ on the basis of theoretical calculation. *Tech* and *Ward*⁷

*Current Address: Department of Physics, Sikkim Manipal Institute of Technology, Majitar, Rangpo, East Sikkim-737132, India.

reinvestigated the matter and performed highly accurate spectroscopic measurement of the line $2p^2(^3P^e) \rightarrow (1s2p)^3P^0$ at $320.2926 \pm 0.0010A^0$. A discrepancy of about $100cm^{-1}$ between the measurements of *Tech.et.al*⁷ and that of *Kruger*⁴ is due to the unavailability of accurate standard wave-lengths at the time of measurement of *Kruger*⁴. *Berry et.al*⁸ also observed the line $2p^2(^3P^e) \rightarrow 1s2p(^3P^0)$ at $320.40 \pm 0.3A^0$.

*Drake and Dalgarno*⁹, *Holøien*¹⁰, *Bhatia*¹¹ calculated the energy of the $(2p^2)^3P^e$ - state of helium by using variational method. Using variational perturbation method *Aashamar*¹² obtained the accurate eigenvalue for the $(2p^2)^3P^e$ - state of neutral helium. All these theoretical investigations predicted the wave length of $2p^2(^3P^e) \rightarrow 1s2p(^3P^0)$ transition of helium range from 320.288 to 320.293 A^0 , and hence are in agreement with the measurement of *Tech et.al*⁷

Under such circumstances it is necessary to perform very accurate spectroscopic calculation of the $(2p^2)^3P^e$ -state of helium. In this article, we propose a method to improve the DES wave function to get not only the best upper bound energy but also rapid convergence with respect to the size of the trial space.

2 Theory

The rotational invariance of the Hamiltonian makes it possible to express the variational equation of two electrons in the field of a fixed nucleus in terms of three independent variables¹³. The three coordinates are the sides of the triangle formed by the three particles i.e., two electrons and the fixed nucleus. The reduction of the three *Eulerian* angles, defining the orientation of this triangle in space, from the variational equation is an immediate consequence of the spherical symmetry of the field. For any ^3P - state of even parity arising from two equivalent electrons, the general variational equation (10) of *Ref.13* reduces to

$$\delta \int \left[\left(\frac{\partial f_1^0}{\partial r_1} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\partial f_1^0}{\partial r_2} \right)^2 + (r_1^{-2} + r_2^{-2}) \left(\frac{\partial f_1^0}{\partial \theta_{12}} \right)^2 + (r_1^{-2} + r_2^{-2}) (f_1^0)^2 \frac{1}{\sin^2 \theta_{12}} + 2(V - E)(f_1^0)^2 \right] dV_{r_1, r_2; \theta_{12}} = 0 \quad (1)$$

subject to the normalization condition

$$\int (f_1^0)^2 dV_{r_1, r_2; \theta_{12}} = 1 \quad (2)$$

The symbols in equation (1) and (2) are same as of *Ref.13*. We use atomic units throughout.

The correlated wavefunction is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} f_1^0(r_1, r_2, r_{12}) = & \eta_1(1)\eta_1(2) \left[\sum_{l>0} \sum_{m>0} \sum_{n \geq 0} B_{lmn} r_1^l r_2^m r_{12}^n \sin \theta_{12} + Exchange \right] \\ & + [\eta_1(1)\eta_2(2) \sum_{l>0} \sum_{m>0} \sum_{n \geq 0} C_{lmn} r_1^l r_2^m r_{12}^n \sin \theta_{12} + Exchange] \\ & + \eta_2(1)\eta_2(2) \left[\sum_{l>0} \sum_{m>0} \sum_{n \geq 0} D_{lmn} r_1^l r_2^m r_{12}^n \sin \theta_{12} + Exchange \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where, $\eta \sim e^{-\rho r}$ and ρ is the non-linear parameter. The linear coefficients B, C, D along with energy eigenvalue E are determined by matrix diagonalisation method.

3 Results

The results of our calculation are given in *Table1*. All calculations were carried out in quadruple precision. The orbital exponents ρ_1 and ρ_2 were optimized using the *Nelder – Mead*¹⁴ procedure and are given in *Table1*.

There are other variational *calculations*^{9–11} of the $(2p^2)^3P^e$ -states for *Helium*. So far best result was obtained by *Bhatia*¹¹. A comparison of present results to that of *Bhatia*¹¹ is given in *Table1*. The total number of terms (N) for each calculation is given in the first column. The results obtained by *Bhatia*¹¹ in second column are compared with the present results in the last column. It's remarkable that for a given number of term (N) the results of the present basis sets are better than that of *Bhatia*¹¹ for next largest basis set e.g. our result for 21 parameter calculation is better than that of 35 parameter calculation of *Bhatia*¹¹, again our 84 parameter result is better than the 97 parameter result of *Bhatia*¹¹ as is evident from *Table1*. Substantial reduction of the number of terms i.e. the basis set size is a clear advantage of the present method for a given calculated energy value. It is relevant to mention that using variational-perturbation technique *Aashamar*¹² obtained the non-relativistic energy for $(2p^2)^3P^e$ - state of helium as $0.71050015560a.u.$. Present variational results of $0.710500155678a.u.$ is even slightly lower than that of variational-perturbation *results*¹².

*Tech et. al*⁷ observed the sharp line in far ultra-violet region with wave number $312,214.52 \pm 0.97 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ corresponding to a wavelength $320.2926 \pm 0.0010 \text{ A}^0$. In order to compare with experiment, we use the well known *experimental*¹⁵ line with wave number $169,087.01 \pm 0.15 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ corresponding to the transition $(1s2p)^3P^0 \rightarrow 1s^2(^1S)$. Adding the wave number of the above two lines, an experimental value of $481,301.53 \pm 0.98 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ for the energy of the doubly excited $(2p^2)^3P^e$ term relative to the ground $(1s^2)^1S$ results. Similarly, combining the observation of *Kruger*⁴ and the experiment of *Martin*¹⁵, an experimental value of $481,205 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ for the energy of the $(2p^2)^3P^e$ -term relative to the ground $1s^2(^1S)$ results. It is clear that there is a discrepancy of approximately 100 cm^{-1} between the experimental results of *Kruger*⁴ and *Tech*⁷. We obtained the position of the $(2p^2)^3P^e$ -state above the ground $1s^2(^1S_0)$ -state by subtracting our calculated energy for the $(2p^2)^3P^e$ -state from the well known⁷ energy $-637,219.54 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ of the ground $1s^2(^1S_0)$ state of helium. The conversion factor $1a.u. = 219,444.528 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ is used. Our calculated value of $481,304.17 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ for the energy of $(2p^2)^3P^e$ -state above the ground $(1s^2)^1S_0$ -state is far from the experimental value of $481,205 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ of *Kruger*⁴, but agrees fairly well with the experimental value of $481,301.53 \pm 0.98 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ of *Tech et.al.*⁷. *Aashamar* obtained a value of $481,301.62 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ for the same including mass polarization, relativistic and radiative effects. A difference of approximately 3 cm^{-1} between our non-relativistic results and that of *Aashamar* or experiment is due to relativistic and other correction.

Finally taking the difference between the present calculated wave number $481,304.17 \text{ cm}^{-1}$

Table 1: **Non-relativistic energy (-E) of He atom in $(2p^2)^3P^e$ -state. All energies are in a. u. The non linear parameters are $\rho_1 = 0.81006481$ and $\rho_2 = 1.07917071$.**

N	<i>Bhatia</i>	<i>PresentMethod</i>
20	0.710456705905	
21		0.71049962427254
35	0.710497876335	
39		0.71050006887316
54		0.71050014164022
56	0.710500049935	
66		0.71050014872252
70	0.710500140510	
84	0.710500142765	0.71050015218194
90	0.710500149950	
95	0.710500151000	
96	0.710500151515	
97	0.710500152070	
99		0.71050015410607
150		0.71050015526295
210		0.71050015554599
267		0.71050015561803
300		0.71050015564129
321		0.71050015564988
336		0.71050015565678

for the $(2p^2)^3P^e$ -state above the ground $1s^2(^1S_0)$ -state of helium and the experimental¹⁵ line at wave number $169,087\text{cm}^{-1}$ for the transition $1s2p(^3P^0) \rightarrow 1s^2(^1S_0)$ of helium, we get the wave number $312,217.16\text{cm}^{-1}$, corresponding to a wavelength $320.2899^0\text{\AA}$ for the transition $2p^2(^3P^e) \rightarrow 1s2p(^3P^0)$ of helium.

4 Acknowledgement

We express gratitude to *Professor A.K.Bhatia* for helpful suggestions. The authors are thankful to *Department of Atomic Energy (DAE), Govt. of India* for a research grant No.2003/37/12/BRNS/622.

5 References

- ¹ E. Holøien, Nucl.Instrum. Methods 90, 229(1970)
- ² U. Fano, in Atomic Physics, edited by V. W. Huges, B. Bedeson, V. W. Cohen and F. M. J. Pichanick(Pleunum, New York, 1969) p.209
- ³ K. T. Compton and J. C. Boyce, J. Franklin Inst, 205, 497(1928).
- ⁴ P. G. Kruger, Phys. Rev. 36, 855(1930).
- ⁵ R. Whiddington and H. Priestley, Proc. Roy. Soc.(London)A 145, 462(1934)
- ⁶ T. Y. Wu, Phys. Rev. 66, 291(1944).
- ⁷ J. L. Tech and J. F. Ward, Phys. Rev. Lett. 27, 367(1971).
- ⁸ H. G. Berry, I. Martinson, L. J. Curtis and L. Lundin, Phys. Rev. A 3, 1934(1971)
- ⁹ G. W. F. Drake and A. Dalgarno, Phys. Rev. A 1, 1325 (1970)
- ¹⁰ E. Holøien, J. Chem. Phys 29, 676(1958); and Phys. Norvegica 1, 53(1960)
- ¹¹ A. K. Bhatia, Phys. Rev.A. 2, 1667(1970).
- ¹² K. Aashamar, Institute for Theoretical Phys., University of Oslo, Norway, Institute Report No.35,1969
- ¹³ Tapan K. Mukherjee and Prasanta K. Mukherjee, Phys. Rev.A 50, 850(1994).
- ¹⁴ J. A. Nelder and R. Mead, Computer J. 7 , 308 (1965).
- ¹⁵ W. C. Martin, J. Res. Nat. Bur. Stand. Sect. A 64, 19(1960)